DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 621 UD 017 115

AUTHOR Fishman, Joshua A.
TITLE Bilingual Education-A Perspective.
INSTITUTION Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Inst. for Urban and Minority Education.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 13p.
AVAILABLE FROM IRCD Bulletin, v12 n2, Spring, 1977. Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y. 10027 ($1.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; *Bilingualism; Bilingual Students; *Definitions; Educational Policy; Educational Practice; *Educational Problems; Ethnic Groups; Minority Group Children; Non English Speaking; *Second Language Learning; Social Factors; Sociolinguistics; Spanish Speaking; *State of the Art Reviews

ABSTRACT

This paper defines bilingual education and notes that because of bilingual education's broad definition, a number of vastly different types of programs and program goals are being pursued. Four broad categories of bilingual education programs based on four different kinds of community and school objectives are discussed in this paper. Each of these is illustrated by an existing or proposed bilingual education program for some Spanish Speaking community. Several rationales advanced for bilingual education are reviewed. Briefly discussed is the issue of how bilingual education might affect the future of language teaching and language learning in the United States. Most American bilingual education programs are viewed as academically compensatory and as socioeconomically compensatory for disadvantaged minority group children from non-English speaking families. It is noted that if bilingual education is sold as a "compensatory promissory note", teachers and citizens will be disappointed. A number of questions about bilingual education are discussed within a comparative and sociolinguistically-oriented framework. Among these are: (1) Must one language always be an "other" tongue? (2) Can the school "go it alone" for bilingual education? (3) Can community interest be too divisive for the good of bilingual education? (4) Does the world or mankind really need all those ethnic languages?. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED142621

IRCD Bulletin

A Publication of the Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

Volume XII, Number 2 Spring 1977

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Bilingual Education — A Perspective*

Joshua A. Fishman

Most Americans, including American intellectuals, have generally been sympathetic to the needs of "other peoples," particularly those from small and developing countries (and therefore, presumably from small and developing cultures), to learn English and, thereby, to become members of the Global Community. "It is always good to know another language (and culture)" is an old "Main Street" saw in the United States, and yet, like most homegrown charitable wisdom, it has been roundly ignored in the Anglo-American heartland itself. Native (and naturalized) Anglo-Americans have long felt themselves to be "beyond that." They have felt that they were *already* members of the Global Community, indeed, that they *were* the Global Community precisely on the basis of their native control of English. Recently, however, this view has begun to change, and the movement for bilingual education is both a product of as well as a contribution to this change.

The standard American claim (or assumption) that Americans are *ipso facto* (part of) the Global Community prompts two related questions:

a) Is there a Global Community? and
b) If there is such, what does membership in it imply for membership in other communities?

Our answer to the first question must be in the affirmative, even though the true Global Community has an extremely small membership. If by "community" we mean a human aggregate which, though largish in size, nevertheless consensually regulates the roles and statuses of its members to an appreciable extent, whether interactionally or referentially, then it becomes clear why the Global Community is as limited in its membership as it is. With the exception of selected academicians, scientists, musicians, artists, entrepreneurs, and fadists, there is no Global Community in the societal sense, and even for the foregoing it is rarely the primary or sole community.

However, it *is* a fact of modern life that more and more humanity does indeed transcend its more primary and more essential memberships on occasion(s). Although such transcendence does not result in a Global Community, it does result in more global sentiments, behaviors, cognitions, and commitments than have existed before.... The Global Community, if it exists or can exist at all for any sizable portion of humanity, gives testimony, therefore, to man's capacity for multiple loyalties and his ability to cope with the tensions which such loyalties may engender....

Members of smaller and poorer nations already realize that they must combine narrower and broader loyalties if they are ever to attain the blessings of the Global Community. Members of larger and richer nations have yet to learn this lesson. A larger and truer Global Community will come into being only if they do.

... the American pursuit of the Global Community has often posited a confrontation or clash between two extremes of social experience: particularism and globalism....

However, as with most other complex social-moral-ethical issues, American (and European) views of particularism vs. globalism must be considered as part of an entire cultural climate. Indeed, this very issue has been subject to rather extreme pendular swings, and once the pendulum has swung as far as it can in one direction, there is nowhere for it to go (as with women's dresses and men's hair styles) but back where it came from....

Since the mass alienation fostered by the Vietnam war

CE017115

*Reprinted from portions of Chapters I, III, IV and IX of *Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective* by Joshua A. Fishman, published by Newbury House Publications, Rowley, Massachusetts, 1976.

JOSHUA A. FISHMAN, Ph.D., is Distinguished University Research Professor, Social Sciences, Yeshiva University (New York) and Director, Summer Institute on Bilingual Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1977.

and by the difficulties encountered by the civil rights movement, we have been on an intimacy binge. ...the small community is good, the small language and the small nationality or ethnic group must be saved, the little traditions of everyday life are beautiful, the community school is precious.... In the light of the unspeakable horrors and inhumanity perpetrated by the great and the strong bearers of mechanistic modernity, all that is "natural" once again seems sweet and good and innocent; and what could be more "natural" than the weak and small peoples of the world and of the submerged continents within the U.S.A. as a whole and on our own long-forgotten personal family trees?

The climate for preserving the peoples "given in nature" and the climate for preserving the animals and plants "given in nature" have come together and have reinforced each other....

... how far [does] the putative parallel between the plant and animal worlds, on the one hand, and the human cultural world, on the other hand, [hold?] There are certainly a number of instructive similarities.... Certainly it is a misreading of human cultural history to conclude that smaller nationalities and their cultures are on the way out. ...just as newer plant and animal species are constantly coming into being, so newer cultural formations are constantly being formed, some of them larger and some of them smaller than others that came before them. The existence today of Indonesians and Israelis and Palestinians and Pakistanis (as well as Chicanos and blacks and Boricuas), none of whom were massive primary cultural groups a third of a century ago, is a tribute to the human need for meaningful and immediate groups of this kind. As certain groups disappear (coalesce, break up, assimilate), others arise to take their place, leaning upon religion, occupation, social class, and other experiential communalities in the constant formation and reformation of cultures. The Global Community, if it is ever to come, will certainly not come inevitably, by the withering away of smaller nationalities.

However, there is one *major* difference between cultural and plant or animal evolution, and that is the phenomenon of multiple-group membership. In the human mind, dogs and horses and lions and mice are all *mammals* and *quadrupeds*, but none of them ever have or ever can appreciate their communality with respect to each other. Human cultural experience is quite different. It not only exhibits but can be aware of and can value multiple-group membership. Thus, while the constant openness of the plant and animal systems militates against the final evolving of any one membership in those systems, the openness of the human cultural systems does *not*. New or old culture-group memberships do not necessarily militate against simultaneous memberships in yet newer or larger cultural formations. It is this possibility that bilingual and bicultural education can foster, particularly if it is adopted by the high and mighty cultures rather than shunted aside merely for the poorer and smaller ones.

...those educators and intellectuals most interested in the Global Community... must be most interested in bilingual and bicultural education *for all our children*, for it is only out of such education that the multiple-group membership can come that can foster such a community for the masses rather than for elites.... Only bilingual and bicultural education provides for multiple memberships and for multiple loyalties in an integrative fashion.... The small nationalities of the world have already (and have long) recognized this truism. ...it is precisely the child who is a native speaker of a language of wider communication (and first and foremost among these, the Anglo-American child) who constitutes a problem in the formation of a larger Global Community....

... The biculturism and bilingualism so needed by most Anglo-American children need not be found in Paris, nor in the junior year abroad, nor in FLES programs, valuable though all of these may be. They can be found on the Anglo-American child's own doorstep, where his black, Chicano, Boricua, Indian, Jewish, and other ethnic neighbors are located. The black, Chicano, Boricua, etc. parents and their children know that *they* need bilingualism and biculturism; but unless the Anglo-American child participates in such education as well, it can only be a "sop to the poor" or a "gimmick for the disadvantaged" rather than a serious quest for a better society and a saner world....

[In the United States, interest in bilingual education has become particularly marked only in the last few years. Far from being regarded as a quest for a better society, however, it has been seen mainly as "something for the poor." Indeed,] the Bilingual Education Act (signed into law by Lyndon B. Johnson on January 2, 1968) [was seen from the beginning by most Americans who thought about it at all as merely] a new panacea for "whatever it is" that ails a segment of our economically disadvantaged. The segment that this act (ultimately Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended in 1967, or Public Law 90-247) recognized for special assistance consisted of those "who came from environments where the dominant language is other than English." Although the act does not restrict itself either to the poor or to the Hispanic and Indian populations of the U.S.A., President Johnson did make this restriction when signing the bill into law, and the "Draft Guidelines to the Bilingual Education Act" prepared by USOE for implementing the act did so quite explicitly. Thus, while any hopes (or fears) that the U.S.A. would support bilingual

IRCD Bulletin

Published quarterly by the Institute for Urban and Minority Education. Subscription rate: $4.00 per year. Back issues: 1-9 copies, $1.00 each; 10-24 copies, $0.80 each; 25-49 copies, $0.60 each; 50 copies and over, $0.50 each.

Edmund W. Gordon, Editor

Send all communications to: Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027.

The Institute for Urban and Minority Education is an agency for human resource development and school organization improvement in the nation's cities. Founded in 1973, the Institute is part of Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York.

education more generally (see the *Proceedings* of the Special Senate Subcommittee's Spring 1967 *Hearings on S428*) were quickly dissipated, the act as such has slowly but surely supported (or, together with state and local authorities co-supported) a steadily growing number of programs.

At this writing, some 220 bilingual education programs are receiving at least partial support under this act, and a like number of others — some that received support in former years and others that have been stimulated by the act indirectly — function entirely on nonfederal funds. Indeed, while five years *before* passage of the act few envisaged any such possibility, now only five years after its passage, half of our states and very many local education authorities have instituted bilingual education codes or programs of their own (among them California, Illinois, New York, Texas, Maryland, Massachusetts), and bilingual education has become an established part of the programs of all major language teachers' associations. In the spring of 1973 new bilingual education bills were introduced in conjunction with congressional plans to revise the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. These resulted in a substantial budgetary increase for Title VII at a time when many other educational budgets were cut. Bilingual education has also enjoyed a modicum of publicity in struggles for control of local school boards or as state and local education budget reviews have come to realize that it "costs money" to prepare and obtain the personnel, curricula, and materials that bilingual education requires. It is at such junctures that the questions have begun to be raised — as they must inevitably be raised, for all promising educational solutions to social problems — "does it work and is it worth it?"

What is Bilingual Education?

In very general terms, bilingual education implies some use of two (or more) languages of instruction in connection with teaching courses other than language *per se*. Thus, neither the smattering of foreign-language instruction that FLES (Foreign Language in Elementary Schools) programs have long been providing to many grade schoolers in the U.S.A. nor the smatterings more normally offered subsequently in most American secondary schools, in the course of foreign-language instruction, qualify as bilingual education. However, wherever courses such as mathematics or history or science (or Bible or Talmud) are taught via a language other than English, while other courses (such as mathematics or history or...) are taught via English, then bilingual education may be said to obtain. However, within this broad definition, it is obvious that vastly different types of programs and program goals can be and are being pursued.

Four Broad Categories of Bilingual Education Programs

It may be instructive to propose (as I have in the past: Fishman and Lovas, 1970) a tentative sociolinguistic typology of bilingual education programs based on four differing kinds of community and school objectives. Each of these types will be briefly illustrated by an existing or proposed bilingual education program for some Spanish-speaking community.[1]

In presenting this typology of bilingual education programs, I would like to distinguish clearly between them and English-as-a-second-language programs. The latter are programs which include no instruction in the student's mother tongue as part of the program.

Another point about this typology is that it is not based on student and schedule characteristics such as proportion of students speaking a certain language and proportion of time devoted to each language. Rather it looks to the kinds of sociolinguistic development implied in the program objectives and suggests that various kinds of programs assume and lead to particular societal rules for the language taught.

Type I: Transitional Bilingualism. In such a program Spanish is used in the early grades to the extent necessary to allow pupils to "adjust to school" and/or to "master subject matter" until their skill in English is developed to the point that it alone can be used as the medium of instruction. Such programs do not strive toward goals of fluency and literacy in both languages with opportunity throughout the curriculum for the continuing improvement toward mastery of each. Rather, they state goals such as "increasing overall achievement of Spanish-speaking students by using both Spanish and English as media of instruction in the primary grades." Such programs (consciously or unconsciously) correspond to the societal objective of language shift and give no consideration to long-range institutional development and support of the mother tongue. An example of such a program can be found in the grant proposal of the Las Cruces (N.M.) School District No. 2 for support of their Sustained Primary Program for Bilingual Students. Perhaps the best way to characterize this program would be to cite the three primary objectives against which the program is to be evaluated:

1. To increase the achievement level of Spanish-speaking youngsters through the use of a sustained K-3 program.
2. To determine whether Spanish-speaking youngsters achieve more in a program that utilizes instruction in both Spanish and English or in a program that is taught in Spanish only.
3. To involve the parents of Spanish-speaking students in the educational program as advisers and learners, thus enriching the home environment of the child.

The entire proposal makes no mention of measuring performance in Spanish or continuing Spanish in the curriculum past grade 3 — or of making any survey of the language situation in the community. Such programs (and there are many of this kind) are basically interested only in transitional bilingualism, i.e., in arriving at the state of English monolingual educational normality just as soon as is feasible without injuring the pupil or arousing the community.

Type II: Monoliterate Bilingualism. programs of this type indicate goals of development in both languages for aural-oral skills but do not concern themselves with literacy skills in the non-English mother tongue. Thus, such programs emphasize developing fluency in Spanish as a link between home and school, with the school providing recognition and support for the language in the domains of home and neighbor-

hood; but they are not concerned with the development of literacy skills in the non-English mother tongue which would facilitate the child's use of the language in conjunction with work, government, religion or book-culture more generally. This type of program is intermediate in orientation between language shift and language maintenance. The likely societal effect of such a program might be one of language maintenance in the short run, but, given the exposure of students to American urban society which stresses and rewards literacy, it might well lead to shift. One example of such a program can be found in Christine McDonald's proposal for the El Rancho United School District in Pico Rivera, California. The program is designed for preschool children, and the parents' and children's home language is used throughout its entire course. However, the focus of the program would be on ultimately developing literacy in English with no reference to similar development in Spanish. Bilingual programs for American Indians frequently fall into this category because, in many instances, there is no body of written literature for the child to learn in his mother tongue. Obviously the intellectual imbalance between English literacy and mother-tongue illiteracy poses a difficult situation for any language-maintenance-oriented community, particularly if it is exposed to occupational mobility through English.

Type III: Biliterate Bilingualism, Partial. This kind of program seeks fluency and literacy in both languages, but literacy in the mother tongue is restricted to certain subject matter, most generally that related to the ethnic group and its cultural heritage. In such a program, reading and writing skills in the mother tongue are commonly developed in relation to the social sciences, literature, and the arts, but not in science and mathematics. This kind of program is clearly one of language maintenance coupled with a certain effort at culture maintenance (perhaps even cultural development should the program result in the production of journalism, poetry, and other literary art forms). In general, the program in the Dade County (Florida) Public Schools (as described in the administrative guideline) exemplifies this type of bilingual education. (See also Rojas, 1966.) The program provides special instruction in English in all skills for all Spanish-speaking students who need it. Additionally, the program provides formal instruction in reading and writing Spanish with emphasis on Spanish literature and civilization as subject matter. Other areas of the curriculum do not utilize Spanish as a medium of instruction. Other programs of this type are conducted by numerous American ethnic groups in their own supplementary or parochial schools.[2] Such programs imply that while non-English mother tongues are serious vehicles of modern literate thought, they are not related to control of the technological and economic spheres. The latter are considered to be the preserve of the majority whose language must be mastered if these spheres are to be entered. Nationalist protest movements since the mid-nineteenth century have consistently rejected any such limiting implication.

Type IV: Biliterate Bilingualism, Full. In this kind of program, students are to develop all skills in both languages in all domains. Typically, both languages are used as media of instruction for all subjects (except in teaching the languages themselves). Clearly this program is directed at language maintenance and development of the minority language. From the viewpoint of much of the linguistically and psychologically oriented literature this is the ideal type of program, since, in the words of one specialist, it results in "balanced, coordinate bilinguals — children capable of thinking and feeling in either of two languages independently."

Programs such as these enable us to ponder the difference between developing balanced competency in individuals and producing a balanced bilingual society. Though highly bilingual societies might find individuals with highly developed competency in all skills and domains very useful in a variety of roles (teachers, translators, business representatives), a fully balanced bilingual speech community seems to be a theoretical impossibility. Balanced competence implies languages that are functionally equivalent, and no society can be motivated to maintain two languages if they are really functionally redundant. Thus, this type of program does not seem to have a clearly articulated goal with respect to societal reality.

Several examples of this type of program exist, but all of them are small pilot or experimental programs. The Coral Way Elementary School (Dade County, Florida) and the Laredo Unified Consolidated Independent School District (Texas) are two frequently cited instances which exemplify this kind of program (Gaarder, 1967; Michel, 1967; Andersson, 1968), not to mention much more recent experiments by Lambert. In the Coral Way School, students take all subjects in both languages, English in the morning from one teacher, Spanish in the afternoon from another teacher. At Laredo Unified, students receive all instruction from the same teacher who uses English half the day and Spanish the other half. The evidence so far suggests that these programs are quite successful, but looking at them from the view of the functional needs of the community, there is serious reservation in my mind whether they should serve as ideal models for large-scale American programs.

Clearly, few American educators or laymen have pondered the four alternatives presented above, let alone their societal implications and requirements. In part this is due to the fact that most American bilingual education programs are of Types I and III above and, therefore, are minimalist insofar as their non-English-language/culture components are concerned. In part this is because Americans tend to view bilingual education as if it were a strictly American sin or virtue; i.e., without any historical or cultural perspective whatsoever.

Why Bilingual Education?

It may be possible to examine at least some of the worldwide and firmewide span of bilingual education while reviewing the rationales advanced for it and the evidence pertaining thereto. Clearly, most American bilingual education programs are viewed as academically *compensatory* to begin with, and, hopefully, therefore also as socioeconomically compensatory for the disadvantaged *minority-group child* from non-English-speaking environments (Gaarder, 1970).

Compensatory Programs. This constriction of bilingual education to overcoming "diseases of the poor," distaste-

ful though it may be, has its well-established precedents in other climes and in other centuries, but most particularly in Europe since the Reformation, wherever the expansion of educational opportunity (or obligation) was stymied by the fact that the official language of education was not always the mother tongue of students new to the educational system. In such circumstances, whether in early-modern France or Germany, in turn-of-the-century or in recent-day Yucatan, Manila, or Moncton, the same claim has been advanced: start the learner off in the language he knows best. The more rapid progress made as a result, insofar as developing learning confidence and satisfaction is concerned, will then pay off in terms of much more rapid progress when the majority language is turned to (and, as some would have it, when more serious educational work is begun). Thus, this approach, when transferred to the American context, typically claims that "learning English" and "getting educated" are not one and the same and that it is worth pursuing the latter via the mother tongue until the former can be tackled and, indeed, that the one will facilitate the other.

A serious evaluation of the above claim is still to come, if by "serious" we mean an opportunity to disentangle the mother tongue effect *per se* from the social, cultural, economic, linguistic, and educational contexts in which it is necessarily embedded. What little research there has been in connection with this claim indicates that there are certainly circumstances under which it is supported,[3] but that, on the whole, bilingual education is too frail a device, in and of itself, to significantly alter the learning experiences of the minority-mother-tongue-poor in general or their majority-language-learning-success in particular. It is of course true that foisting a language other than their own upon such children is equivalent to imposing an extra burden upon those least capable of carrying it. However, precisely because there are so many other pervasive reasons why such children achieve poorly the goals of majority-oriented and -dominated schools (and societies), removing this extra burden above — and leaving all else as it was — does not usually do the trick, particularly when the teachers, curricula, and materials for bilingual education are as nonoptimal as they currently usually are. My own feeling is that just as there is no simple school-based solution to the learning problems of the alienated-in-general, we cannot and should not expect bilingual education to provide such a solution for the non-English-mother-tongue-alienated-poor in particular. If there is a sufficient rationale for bilingual education, and I believe there is, it must be found on other than compensatory grounds, particularly inasmuch as most compensatory programs are merely transitional or monoliterate and, therefore, hardly constitute bilingual education in a context in which it is most likely to succeed. Who among us would care to defend the contribution of (or the prospects for) science education or social studies education on the basis of its effectiveness with alienated and dislocated populations such as those receiving compensatory bilingual education?

Enrichment Programs. When we turn our gaze from the poor to the middle class and above, we find bilingual education typically far more intensive and justified not on the grounds of compensation but of enrichment. "To them that hath shall be given." Those who are relatively secure in their social, economic, and political power can afford and, indeed, often seek an additional educational and cultural exposure to that afforded them by their own mother tongue and immediate milieu. Thus, rather than merely being a palliative for the poor, bilingual education has been long and widely viewed by advantaged groups as "an elitist thing." Whether we are interested in the classical world or in the modern, in the West or in the East, bilingual education has been savored by the fortunate few and, apparently, found to be very good indeed.[4]

There have been several attempts to expand such efforts in recent decades so that the enrichment formerly reserved for the patrician might be made more widely available. Most of these have not been exposed to research evaluations, but the impressions of serious and sophisticated observers are positive regarding the bilingual schools of Singapore (largely in Chinese and English), or of LWC schools in the Soviet Union (E.G. Lewis, 1972), of areas in Wales, and of the Yeshiva movement in the U.S.A.[5] It is felt that the intellective and nonintellective results obtained are generally as good as or better than those in monolingual schools for students of comparable backgrounds. However, the one serious study of truly widespread compulsory bilingual education, the one conducted in Ireland (Macnamara, 1966), disclosed negative findings as well. Because of the time and effort invested in teaching Irish *per se*, as well as in teaching via Irish, to children who neither knew it nor used it out of school, elementary school graduates were on the average a year behind students of comparable backgrounds in England with regard to tested achievement in English and in mathematical problem solving — at the same time that their active grasp of Irish remained rather marginal at best. Once again, it is not possible to say, on the basis of one such study, whether it is the overextension of bilingual education *per se* that exacted this toll or whether it was exacted by the particular context of widespread disinterest in and perceived uselessness of Irish in present-day Ireland. On the whole, I would tend to favor the latter interpretation of the Irish findings (primarily because it agrees with my own preliminary findings based on international data) and to believe that well-disposed and supported schools, serving well-disposed and reasonably comfortable clienteles, can carry on bilingual education as successfully as most others carry on monolingual education and that the resulting educational product may be deemed well worth the additional cost and effort that may be entailed.

Group-Maintenance Programs. No matter how successful enrichment-oriented bilingual education for the relatively comfortable and secure may be, it still does not come to grips with the problems of self-perceived minorities, poor or otherwise. What spokesmen for some of the latter have been emphasizing (and, once more, throughout the world and across time) is neither "compensation" nor "enrichment" but rather the preservation and enhancement of the group as such. However, bilingual education rationalized in group-maintenance and culture-maintenance terms is also considered to help the individual learner. A minority student who is confident of and

recognized in his more intimate primary-group membership relates more positively both to school and to society (both of which are majority-dominated) and, as a result, profits more from schooling. There is hardly any research evidence pertaining to such claims in conjunction with bilingual education, although the view itself is a long- and well-established one, particularly in the context of cultural pluralism and minority rights. In this context, however, it is primarily an article of faith, a moral and ethical position, a basic social right, and as such, not likely to benefit seriously from, or to be much subjected to, objective and empirical research.

The common argument *against* group-maintenance-oriented bilingual education is that it is conducive to sociopolitical tensions, at the very least, and to sociopolitical ruptures, at worst. This may well be so, in certain minority-majority contexts at particular times and in particular places and, therefore, would seem to merit more or less consideration as local circumstances dictate. Certainly the demand for group-maintenance-oriented bilingual education has been advanced by both groups and individuals who have had only sociocultural goals rather than sociopolitical ones. As a result of such demands the growth of mother-tongue instruction for minority-group children, at least during the early elementary school years, has been truly phenomenal during the past quarter century and may become worldwide before this century is out. The result of this movement has been a corresponding increase in partial bilingual education, if the entire period of school attendance is considered. Very few, if any, secessionist movements have been spawned thereby or related thereto, and it would seem to me to be more wicked than wise to raise any such bugaboo in conjunction with discussions of bilingual education in the U.S.A. today. The right of large concentrations of parents to have their children educated in their own mother tongue at public expense; the right of individuals to defend and protect the primary groups to which they belong most intimately, at the same time that they hold and cultivate multiple loyalties to more inclusive groups; the right of much smaller groups to coexist within the larger groups with which they have symbiotic ties — all these must not be philosophically beclouded by possibly baseless innuendos. When coterritorial groups move toward separatism, it is almost never because of conflicts over bilingual education.

Like much else that has transpired in American education during the past decade, bilingual education has come about as a result of the confluence of organized pressures and innovative initiatives. Like much else that is promising in American education today, bilingual education suffers from four serious lacks: a lack of funds (Title VII has been pitifully starved), a lack of trained personnel, a lack of evaluated experience (with respect to curricula, materials, and methods) and a lack of sociohistorical perspective. It is not and cannot be a cure-all for the myriad disadvantages faced by the millions of poor non-English-mother-tongue children in our society. It could possibly be a powerful enrichment for the many other millions of more affluent American children, but such is our current blindness with respect to it that we largely insist on seeing it merely as "something for the poor." Nevertheless, it is in this latter *general* enrichment manifestation, as well as in the context of the self-maintenance efforts of our various non-Anglo cultural groups, that its true contribution to American education and society will ultimately be made.

Bilingual Education, Language Learning, and Language Teaching

[As I mentioned at the beginning of the last section, bilingual education has become an established part of the programs of all major language teachers associations. That being so, it is legitimate for language teachers, and those interested in language teaching and language learning, to ask themselves how bilingual education might affect the future of language teaching and language learning in this country.]

I have been a "language teaching watcher" for many years, and my impression is that this is an exciting field. During the past third of a century, there has been as much innovative theory, curricular and methodological rethinking, and sophisticated debunking in the language teaching field as in the much stressed mathematics-sciences field. This says a great deal about the intellectual vitality of the field of language teaching, and it clearly distinguishes it (as well as math-sciences) from the social sciences and the humanities, which regrettably have remained comparatively quiescent in terms of revisions in instructional theory or methodology. Indeed, the *growing* relationship between the language field and the math-science field on the one hand (in terms of the forces that shape American life and American education) and the shrinking relationship between the language field and the humanities-social sciences field on the other hand is related both to the *heights* and to the *depths* that American language teaching has experienced since the beginning of World War II.

Extrasocietal and External Societal Influences

During and immediately after World War II — war needs themselves being among the most dramatic influences that American language teaching has *ever* experienced — the most influential ideas shaping American language teaching methods were derived from linguistics and from psychology. I refer to these as *extrasocietal* influences since neither the view that gave primacy to syntax and phonology over lexicon and use, nor the view that gave primacy to listening comprehension and to speech over reading and writing, had any societal image, purpose, or function explicitly in mind. They did not attempt to cope with the question: "What should be the role of subsequent languages in the life of the learner and in the life of society?" There was absolutely no conscious "language-in-society" model underlying either of these powerful methodological approaches, both of which are still very much with us today.

Although the same extrasocietal designation is *not* true with respect to the *second most powerful force* influencing American language teaching during the past third of a century — here I refer to the post-sputnik panic and the realization that language expertise was vital for defense-related purposes — that force was an *external* societal factor rather than an internal one. The threat of Soviet technological modernization imposed itself upon us from outside our own boundaries, and even when language instruction responded to that threat with all the "nondeliberate" speed at its command, it never (well,

"hardly ever") linked up its contribution to national defense with the indigenous language resources internal to American society. The "Language Resources Project" that I headed from 1960-1963, and that resulted in my *Language Loyalty in the United States*, tried to provide such an internal societal link, but it was an idea whose time had not quite yet come. The common American approach to language learning (and, indeed, the common approach of the language teacher *per se* to the commodity he was "pushing") was that additional languages are useful or crucial for our national well-being *particularly* if such languages are (a) learned in school rather than in the context of home and community, (b) learned as a mature adult (in college and graduate school), (c) learned as a target, in itself, rather than as a process for the mastery of other material, and are (d) exotic to the American content in terms of easy access to the learner.

The Ascendancy of Societal Concerns

Let us quickly skip over all that the concentration on external threat enabled foreign-language teaching to accomplish. The rapid expansion (indeed duplication) of programs, increase in positions, and mushrooming of student incentive funds has been recounted many times. Let us turn immediately to the realization that during the past decade (1965-1975)most of the impetus for change in language teaching and language learning has had strong indigenous societal roots, although external considerations still play their part. In this past decade language teaching in the United States has had to respond, as never before, to internal social issues and social needs such as the urban disadvantaged, the alienation of youth, the ethnic minorities, the rebirth of ethnicity among some whose parents fancied that they had escaped from it, and, most recently, the fiscal crunch. Many of these societal needs and reemerging lost continents have hit language instruction *directly*, in that the high priorities given to them have left proportionately fewer taxpayer and foundation dollars for other needs. In addition, the educational establishment's reactions to those needs and pressures have often hit language instruction *indirectly*, by permitting greater latitude in student choice of subjects to be studied, greater opportunity for "alternative" forms and contents of education, and, correspondingly, lesser insistence on language learning as new subjects and as new populations enter our high schools, colleges, and universities.

For one reason or another, language enrollments have generally been dropping, language requirements have been fading, the attack on language learning has been mounting, and — as in all times of strife and disappointment — the time and mood are ripe for a new panacea, a good bet, a stimulating idea, a rallying cause, or, at the very least, a straw to clutch at. It is at this point that bilingual education enters the picture to save Little Red Riding Hood from the Big Bad Wolf.

Bilingual Education and Compensatory Education

There is growing recognition in language teaching circles — as in education circles more generally — that a sizable proportion of the disadvantaged lack facility in English — not to mention standard school English — and that if their educational progress is not to be appreciably delayed and diluted, they had best be taught most subjects in their non-English mother tongues, at least until ESL gets through to them. The recent *Lau* decision of the Supreme Court may soon foster a nationwide approach along these lines, and yet, with all of its welcome relief for all children whose English is really insufficient for the burden of educational effort, I doubt that it will do much for language instruction. Bilingual education that is merely compensatory, merely transitional, is merely a desperate attempt to fight fire with fire. If a non-English mother tongue is conceptualized as a disease of the poor, then in true vaccine style this disease is to be attacked by the disease baccilus itself. A little bit of deadened mother tongue, introduced in slow stages in the classroom environment, will ultimately enable the patient to throw off the mother tongue entirely and to embrace all-American vim, vigor, and vitality.

My own evaluation is that compensatory bilingual education is not a good long-term bet, neither for language teaching nor for bilingual education *per se*. The multiproblem populations on whose behalf it is espoused — underprivileged, unappreciated, alienated — cannot be aided in more than an initial palliative sense by so slender a reed as compensatory bilingual education. Populations that would present almost insuperable problems to our schools and to all of our establishment institutions, even if they were *monolingual* English speakers, will not cease being such problems merely because they are offered a year or two of introductory education primarily in their non-English mother tongues. Their problems and our hangups are not that simple to overcome.

Bilingual education "sold" as a compensatory promissory note will disappoint us all — teachers and citizens alike. It will not solve the basic societal problems of the non-English-speaking poor, and, therefore, will not solve their basic educational problems. It will soon be just another educational gimmick gone sour, and language teaching as well as bilingual education as a whole will both suffer needlessly as a result of having made yet another bad bet.

Bilingual Education and Ethnic Legitimacy

There is another rationale for bilingual education, and it might well be of somewhat greater interest to language teachers and to American society at large. Thanks to our recent sensitivity to ethnicity, the non-English mother tongues and cultures in our midst are recognized as things of beauty, to be maintained and treasured forever and ever. These languages and cultures are recognized not for manipulative, compensatory, and transitional purposes, but as basic ingredients of a healthy *individual* self-concept and of sound *group* functioning. Groups that are deprived of their languages and cultures are dislocated groups. Such groups have no alternative but to dump dislocated and alienated students on the doorstep of the school and of all other institutions of the larger society. Greater *self*-acceptance among non-English-mother-tongue children (including acceptance of their parents and their traditions and their immediate societies) and greater mutual acceptance between such children and the American mainstream will also foster greater genuine school progress. Bilingual education under this rationale is *group-maintenance-*

oriented, and, as a result, not merely a compensatory, transitional "quickie."

Note, however, that therein lies an unstated assumption, namely, that bilingual education is needed only for the "unmeltable ethnics." Such a view is still patronizing — although "patronizing once removed" — in that it assumes that non-ethnics are above and beyond bilingual education and "all that." Language and ethnicity are still assigned to the "outer fringe," beyond the propriety of White Anglo-Saxon Protestantdom. Enlightened patronization would not be a propitious approach to strengthening the impact of mathematics or history in American education or in American life, and I predict that, welcome though it may be among the Navajos, it will do little or nothing for the place of language learning in our schools and in our society more generally.

Bilingual Education for Enrichment

In various parts of Canada (and not only in French Canada) economically comfortable English-speaking parents are voluntarily sending their eager youngsters to primarily-but-not-entirely French schools. Such "immersion schools" for societally favored youngsters also exist in France, Germany, Latin America, the Soviet Union, the Arab World, Italy, Belgium, not to mention many, many parts of Africa and Asia. They bring together two languages of wider communication — rather than one pitifully small language and one gargantuanly large one. They involve the populations most able to pay for a good education and most likely to succeed educationally and societally — rather than those least favored in these respects. They require the most advantaged to *stretch further* educationally and, thus, are really an enrichment for the rich. They continue, albeit at a somewhat more accessible level, the bilingual education tradition practiced by most elites from the days of the ancient Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans on. They are eminently successful and therefore attract the best students, teachers, and administrators. Regrettably, such schools are almost unknown in the public sector of American education.

Of course, bilingual education for enrichment also involves some unspoken assumptions. It assumes that it is particularly the well off who not only stand to gain by an additional cultural exposure but that, indeed, they are the very ones for whom such an exposure is an acceptable and even a powerful motivating argument. My own view is that enrichment (or immersion) bilingual education is the best way of demonstrating the *academic* and *societal* advantages of bilingual education. I am sure that it is *this* kind of bilingual education that could become the most reliable prop for language teaching in the United States, just as it has become such in some of the countries I have mentioned. Such a prop would be more than a fad, more than a nostrum, if it were ever to catch on. It represents bilingual education not only at its best but at its broadest. However, I am not sure that "middle America," in whose image most of our secondary and higher educational institutions are shaped, is ready for it, or ever will be.

Bilingual Education in Sociolinguistic Perspective

If there is anything that bilingual education has to contribute to language teaching more generally, it is its maximization of *language learning for the communication of messages that are highly significant* for senders and receivers alike, both in their individual as well as in their actual and potential societal capacities. There is simply no way in which language teaching which focuses on language as a *target of instruction* can fully capture the total impact upon the learner which is available to language teaching which also capitalizes upon language as the *process of instruction*. Because bilingual education does just that — particularly in its enrichment guise, but also in its compensatory and group-maintenance guises which definitely have a validity of their own (although of a more temporally or demographically restricted nature) — it provides a powerful and worldwide boost to language teaching. However, like every potential solution, it poses potential problems as well.

Is the American public mature enough for enrichment-oriented bilingual education? Are we and our colleagues in the language teaching profession mature enough to move toward it rather than to reject it because of our personal inadequacies and societal biases? My own tendency is to view the future in optimistic terms. I see the future of language teaching and language learning in the United States as including a greater variety of rationales, goals, and methods than has hitherto been the case. I see bilingual education as part of this variety, and I see more language teachers able to engage in it than previously, whether for compensatory, group-maintenance, or enrichment purposes. Indeed, I see American bilingual educators being able to engage in *various kinds* of bilingual education, rather than merely in one kind or another, depending on the students and communities to which they are addressing themselves. Finally, I see more second-language teachers also able to engage in bilingual education and more bilingual educators being able to engage in second-language instruction, rather than two quite distinct groups of language practitioners, as is most often the case in the U.S.A. today.

As for bilingual education itself, it is *but one* opportunity to revitalize language teaching among many. It is itself *internally diversified* into compensatory, group-maintenance, and enrichment streams and must not be viewed as one undifferentiated blob. It has its own problems of training and funding. It can no more *remake society, education,* or even *language teaching* than can any other partial solution to all-encompassing and multifaceted problems. It should not be underrated, but it should not be *oversold* on false premises. It has functions that go above and beyond language teaching. However, I know that it is *here to stay* as a *worldwide phenomenon* today, with outcroppings in over 100 countries, and I trust that America too will profit from it and contribute to it in the days to come....

Some Questions about Bilingual Education

[A] number of issues pertaining to bilingual education that have been particularly worrisome of late to American educators and to community leaders with educational concerns [are discussed here within a comparative and sociolinguistically oriented framework that may] shed some light on these issues and concerns.

Must One Language Always Be an "Other" Tongue?

The implication of an "other" tongue is frequently somewhat invidious relative to the mother tongue. It often denotes an out-group. It usually connotes foreignness. Can that be overcome? Yes and no.

There are societies engaged in bilingual education whose members consider both of the languages that are involved to be *their own*. Such societies are called diglossic (Fishman, 1967). The outstanding examples today are the use of vernacular and classical Arabic as media in parts of the Arab world, Yiddish and Hebrew as media in much of Jewish Orthodox education, Demotic Greek and Katharevusa as media in Greece.... Both languages may not be equally used, or may not even both be used for textual (reading/writing) purposes, but they are both definitely *their own* to the pupils, teachers, administrators, and parents. Nevertheless, even in this case only one of the two is the mother tongue of one and all. Thus, the lesson to be learned is that *foreignness can be overcome* — by dint of long and stable positive association, on a widespread societal basis, with the "other" tongue. Nevertheless, even when the "other" tongue is no longer societally foreign, it is still not the same as the mother tongue: not in intimacy nor in the whole range of functions for which it is considered appropriate. This is necessarily so. No society needs or has two languages for the same functions. As a result, no society, not even those whose bilingualism has been most widespread and most stable, raises its children with two mother tongues. There is always an "other" tongue, and the purpose of bilingual education is not to have the other tongue compete with the mother tongue for its societally recognized functions. Nevertheless, the other tongue need not connote things foreign and fearful; indeed, given sufficient societal commitment in that direction, bilingual education can be a powerful assisting force on behalf of divesting the "other" tongue and the "other" group of its foreignness. That is exactly what bilingual education at its best is all about.

Can the School "Go It Alone" for Bilingual Education?

Definitely not, not even when there is a clear mandate to do so. One of the major conclusions to be derived from the International Study of Bilingual Secondary Education is that not only is community consensus needed if bilingual education is to succeed, but that the help of the unmarked language community is needed every bit as much as, it not more than, that of the marked language community.* The main trouble with foreign-language learning thus far has been that it was entirely a school-dependent affair with no out-of-school contextual significance whatsoever. Bilingual education that is left to the schools alone will have the same sad fate. The school can provide instructional power for bilingual education but not functional power for it. The latter must be provided by the community itself in terms of either dignifying its own diversity or the diversity of the international community. Dignifying diversity can take many shapes. It can take the shape of "protecting neglected national resources" of the language-and-culture kind in our own back yards (for details see Fishman, 1966, Chapter 14, or Fishman, 1972b, Chapter 2). It can be related to visitors, travel, concerts, visits, exhibits, projects, jobs, student creativity, correspondence. But it should be tied as securely and as fully as possible to community-supported undertakings rather than merely to those that the school alone espouses and maintains.... Community interest and involvement on behalf of bilingual education is a must for a successful program. American educators have long sought ways of fostering closer school-community ties — even for the sake of history, mathematics, and biology instruction. Such ties are all the more necessary for bilingual education, and bilingual education itself can often contribute to the fostering of such ties.

*The International Study of Bilingual Secondary Education (ISBSE) directed by the author, obtained information from some 1200 bilingual secondary schools and programs thoughout the world during 1972 to 1973. The ISBSE was the research forerunner of the volume from which this article has been excerpted: *Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective*.

Can Community Interest Be Too Divisive for the Good of Bilingual Education?

Yes, at times. If the unmarked language community is apathetic or opposed, and if all of the interest in bilingual education comes from oppressed minorities, bilingual education finds itself in a context of pressures, tensions, grievances, conflicts, and cleavages. Such developments frequently obtain at early periods of bilingual education, when it is wanted more by the "have-nots" than by the "haves." What is needed under these circumstances is a campaign to familiarize the "haves" with the benefits of enrichment-oriented bilingual education for them and for their children....

There is absolutely no reason why bilingual education should be made all of one cloth (e.g., "compensatory") throughout any given community. There is no reason why it should be entirely oriented around the needs of one group of children (e.g., the disadvantaged). There is no reason at all why education as a whole should suffer as a result of bilingual education. There is no reason why monolingual teachers should lose their jobs as a result of bilingual education, and there is also no reason why most such teachers cannot slowly become bilingual themselves and thus of greater benefit to society, to the educational system, and to their pupils. There is no reason for community divisiveness in connection with bilingual education.... Where divisiveness obtains, it is not the fault of bilingual education but of lack of appreciation for the diversity of the community and the diversity of the world. That diversity will not go away just because it is ignored or covered up by unmarked paint. Quite the contrary. Under such circumstances it will continue to "crop out" unexpectedly and unproductively. When bilingual education is given the communitywide support that it needs and deserves, the diversity that it heralds will be unifying and gratifying, not only cognitively but emotionally and esthetically as well.

Does the World or Mankind Really Need All Those Ethnic Languages?

Ethnicity is one of the inevitable attributes of social life, and new ethnicities arise, old ones alter, and others disappear. No aggregative future is possible for mankind without ethnic-

ity and, therefore, without languages strongly related to ethnic experiences. To look forward to the death of ethnicity is to misunderstand man and society. It is a particularly modern misunderstanding, one not shared by the ancient Hebrews, Greeks, Romans, Church Fathers, or early Islamic thinkers, all of whom had a capacity for combining both ethnicity and supra-ethnicity in their theories or philosophies of desired social organization. Their more balanced view toward ethnicity and toward bilingualism and linguistic diversity was lost by Western philosophers from the eighteenth century onward.

This is a loss that badly and sadly needs to be corrected, for our modern pursuit of the rational and efficient mass-society, state and world is crippled as a result. No matter how much international One World awareness grows, and may it grow as much and as quickly as possible, the human need and capacity for subgroup membership on the basis of traditional intimacy will go on and on. Indeed, ethnicity grows stronger when denied, oppressed, or repressed, and becomes more reasonable and more tractable when recognized and liberated (Fishman, 1972a). One of the strengths of bilingual education is that it accepts ethnicity and brings it into the open as well as into contact with modern ideas and modern goals.

Finally, let it be acknowledged that the supposedly non-ethnic and supra-ethnic Languages of Wider Communication and the modern, quantitative, technological pursuits and life-styles with which they are purportedly associated are themselves not free of ethnicity. They are reacted to as such (e.g., as being Western European or American) in many parts of the world by uncounted millions. Our espousal of them is self-serving rather than entirely altruistic. It leaves us "on top" and relieves us, at the same time, from acknowledging the ethnic-cultural coloration with which that life-style is suffused. We do not so much despise ethnicity as much as we are impatient with other people's ethnicity. In practice we are quite ethnocentric, every bit as much as "all those little peoples," but, unlike them, we try to hide it from ourselves and pretend that what we are is "above and beyond that," is panhuman, the wave of the future. If bilingual education can help save us from this disease that has not only blinded us (to ourselves and to the world) but caused us to try to spread it to others, then it will have served us nobly.

What About Subject Matter Achievement *Per Se*? Isn't There Necessarily an "Educational Price To Pay" for Using as Comedium a Language Which Is Not the Child's Strongest Language?

The very way in which this question is asked reveals an unconscious assumption as to the societal context of bilingual education, namely, that education in a marked language is being urged upon children for whom the unmarked language is the mother tongue. From the ISBSE results, and from all that was known about comparative bilingual education before the ISBSE results were available, it should be clear that the above-mentioned societal context is really only one out of many in which bilingual education operates. Indeed, a far more common context for bilingual education is precisely the one in which *it is the means of providing education via the mother tongue* for marked language communities whose children had heretofore received (and would otherwise still receive) their education entirely in an unmarked "other tongue." If bilingual education does nothing else, it at least equalizes the children of marked- and unmarked-language backgrounds by providing each of them some instruction via their own mother tongue as well as some via the "other" group's mother tongue. If this removes an advantage that the unmarked community's children previously had (since they previously received *all* of their education in their mother tongue, whereas the marked children previously received *none* of their education in their mother tongue), then at least the "price" is being paid (i.e., the "sacrifice" is being made) by those best able to pay it (Fishman and Lueders, 1972).

But the general question (rather than its unconscious overtones) must still be faced up to. The answer must be seen in terms of social class and academic-motivational variation. Controlling for such factors, the brunt of the current evidence is that children whose bilingual education starts early enough (e.g., *no later than* the beginning of secondary school and as much before that as possible) and continues at a sufficiently intensive level within a generally positive familial, communal, and societal framework *do not lose out at all in subject matter achievement* when compared with their peers receiving monolingual education.... Their language acquisition apparatus is still flexible enough for them to be able to acquire rapidly facility in any new language toward which they are attitudinally positive and to be able to rather quickly begin using that new language for purposes of further subject matter acquisition. Thus, unlike older or more negative learners, their "weaker language" soon becomes strong enough (under "immersion" or "ulpan" methods of language instruction) to become a vehicle for receptive and active communication and learning. The level of such learning will then depend on other factors, e.g., on those that more generally influence subject matter achievement: home environment, community reward and societal recognition, personal interest and ability, peer-group reinforcement, etc. Children with better personal and societal endowments will continue to do better and disadvantaged children will continue to be *relatively* disadvantaged, but this will be due to out-of-school inequalities rather than due to bilingual education *per se*. In none of the countries in which bilingual education is common is it in any way associated with lower achievement than in the monolingual schools serving comparable populations.

When all is said and done, bilingual education "gives" much more than it "takes away." The unmarked-language child has at least acquired entrée into a language and culture that would otherwise have been for him a closed book. His unmarked-language attainment need not be a whit lower than it would otherwise have been, provided familial, communal and societal support for bilingual education is there. The latter is equally true for the marked-language child vis-à-vis *his* unmarked-language attainments, but in addition he has been given the opportunity to experience the dignity of his patrimony within the secular sanctity of the school.

FOOTNOTES

1. Many examples of other than Spanish-related bilingual education at the elementary level are provided in John and Horner, 1971; and in Andersson and Boyer, 1970. An appreciably different (and much more detailed) typography of bilingual education is available in Mackey, 1970.
2. Over a thousand such programs under other than Jewish auspices are reviewed in Fishman, 1966, Chapter 5: "The Ethnic Group School and Mother Tongue Maintenance" (pp. 92-126).
3. Among the supportive evidence cited by John and Horner is that contained in reports by Modiano (1968), Osterberg (1961), Pryor (1967), Richardson (1968), pertaining to Mexican Indians, Swedes, Mexican-Americans, and Cuban-Americans, respectively. In Osterberg's project young speakers of Pitean (a nonstandard Swedish dialect) learning to read in their dialect fared better than Pitean-speaking children learning to read the literary dialect. Indirect support is also available from other programs that employ a nonstandard dialect for transitional or monoliterate purposes.
4. Two recent and well-done evaluative case studies of such programs, both with general positive findings, are to be found in Mackey, 1972 and in Lambert and Tucker, 1972.
5. The bilingual nature of traditional Jewish education does not properly fit into our discussion here because, on the one hand, it was not rationalized on the grounds of enrichment, and on the other, it was a reflection of *within-group* bilingualism (Yiddish and Loshen Koydesh) rather than of between-group bilingualism such as that best characterizing all the other examples cited in this paper.

REFERENCES

Andersson, Theodore. "Bilingual Elementary Schooling: A Report to Texas Educators." *Florida FL Reporter*, 34 (1968), No. 6, 25.

Andersson, Theodore and Mildred Boyer (eds.). *Bilingual Schooling in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1970 (2 vols.).

Fishman, J.A. *Language Loyalty in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.

———. "Bilingualism with and Without Diglossia; Diglossia with and Without Bilingualism." *Journal of Social Issues*, 23 (1967), No. 2, 29-38.

———. *Language and Nationalism*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1972a.

———. *Language in Sociocultural Change*. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1972b.

Fishman, Joshua A. and John Lovas. "Bilingual Education in Sociolinguistic Perspective." *TESOL Quarterly*, 4 (1970), 215-22.

Fishman, J.A. and Erica Lueders. "What Has the Sociology of Language to Say to the Teacher?" In C.B. Cazden, Vera John and Dell Hymes (eds.), *Functions of Language in the Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972; reprinted in Fishman, 1972b.

Gaarder, A. Bruce. "Organization of the Bilingual School." *Journal of Social Issues*, 23 (1967), 110-20.

———. "The First Seventy-six Bilingual Education Projects." *Georgetown University Monograph Series in Language and Linguistics*, 23 (1970), 69-76.

John, Vera P. and Vivian M. Horner. *Early Childhood Bilingual Education*. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1971.

IRCD **Bulletin**

SUBSCRIPTION NOTICE

The **IRCD Bulletin** is published quarterly on a calendar year basis. The cost of a subscription is $4.00 per year (four issues). In order to subscribe, please complete the form below and send it with your check or money order for $4.00 to:

Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Box 40
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

Subscriptions must be prepaid. Please make check or money order payable to Teachers College. Subscriptions are accepted for complete calendar year volumes only.

Please enter my subscription to the **IRCD Bulletin.** Enclosed is $4.00. I understand that I will receive four issues.

Name _____

Address _____

_____

_____ Zip Code _____

Please check one of the following categories which best describes your affiliation:

- ☐ College or University
- ☐ Elementary or Secondary School/System
- ☐ Governmental Agency
- ☐ Library or Information Center
- ☐ Public or Private Agency
- ☐ Other (Please specify)

_____

Lambert, Wallace E. and G.R. Tucker. *Bilingual Education of Children*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1972.

Lewis, E. Glyn. *Multilingualism in the Soviet Union*. The Hague: Mouton, 1972.

Mackey, William F. "A Typology of Bilingual Education." *Foreign Language Annals*, 3 (1970), 596-608; also in J.A. Fishman (ed.), *Advances in the Sociology of Language II*. The Hague: Mouton, 1972, 413-32.

——— *Bilingual Education in a Binational School*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1972.

Macnamara, John. *Bilingualism and Primary Education*. London: Edinburgh University Press, 1966.

Michel, John. "Tentative Guidelines for a Bilingual Curriculum." *Florida FL Reporter*, 5 (1967), No. 3, 13-16.

Modiano, Nancy. "National or Mother Language in Beginning Reading: A Comparative Study." *Research in the Teaching of English*, 1 (1968), 32-43.

Osterberg, T. *Bilingualism and the First School Language*. Umea: Vasterbottens Tryckeri AB, 1961.

Pryor, G.C. *Evaluation of the Bilingual Project of Harlandale Independent School District in the First Grades of Four Elementary Schools During the 1966-67 School Year*. San Antonio, Texas: Harlandale School District, 1967.

Richardson, M. "An Evaluation of Certain Aspects of the Academic Achievement of Elementary Pupils in a Bilingual Program, Coral Gables, Florida." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Miami, 1968.

Rojas, Pauline. "The Miami Experience in Bilingual Education." In Carol J. Freidler (ed.), *On Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Champaign, Ill.: National Council on the Teaching of English, 2 (1966), 43-45.

Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education (U.S. Senate). *Bilingual Education: Hearings on S. 428*. (2 vols.). Washington, D.C.: USGPO, 1967.

ERIC/CUE
PUBLICATIONS LIST AVAILABLE

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education (ERIC/CUE) has a complete list of its publications available, at no cost. Copies of the list can be obtained from:

ERIC/CUE
Box 40
Teachers College, Teachers College
New York, New York 10027

IRCD BULLETIN
Edmund W. Gordon, Editor
Teachers College, Columbia University
Box 40
525 West 120th Street
New York, New York 10027

Volume XII, Number 2

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED